In re Appln. of PANKOVCIN
Application No. 09/739,715
Reply to Office action of December 10, 2004

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In the application, no claims currently stand allowed and claims 1 – 20 stand rejected.

Claims 1 – 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gershman et al.

("Gershman"), U.S. Patent No. 6,199,099.

Independent claims 1, 6, 9, 13, 19, and 20 have been amended to include a further

clarification that the parsing is done in accordance with format specified by the parsing module.

Before turning to the specific claim language, Applicants believe a short synopsis of the

invention might be useful. The specification teaches in particular embodiments a method and

system for processing data records having multiple formats, in which each format to be

parsed has a plug-in module associated with it. As is explained on pages 2 and 3 of the

specification, each plug-in module has a uniform interface that can be accessed by, for

example, a parsing engine or other client. The parsing engine may, in turn, provide services

for manipulating data to the plug-in modules in order to assist them in performing their

respective tasks. A standard format can be provided to allow data from the records to be

stored in a database.

In contrast to the Applicants' invention, the Gershman reference teaches a method for

facilitating web-based information retrieval, wherein a wireless phone or similar hand-held

wireless device prompts a user to input information of interest to the user. This information is

transmitted to a service routine that queries the Web utilizing a distributed communication

network to find price, shipping and availability information from various Web suppliers. The

user may then use the hand-held device to place an order interactively utilizing a distributed

communication network.

In re Appln. of PANKOVCIN
Application No. 09/739,715
Reply to Office action of December 10, 2004

The Office action references column 10, lines 43 – 45 and column 11, lines 31 – 33 of the Gershman reference to illustrate that Gershman teaches a parsing for one or more multiple formats of data records. Even if one were to accept this statement, the parsing functionality in Gershman is explicitly defined for *one, and only one,* particular format. Indeed this is made abundantly clear by the Gershman reference itself at column 20, lines 59 – 66:

> There are 4 ways in which the delimiters can be placed. We take care of all these cases by reducing them down to Case 4 in which there are no delimiters around but only between fields in a string (e.g., A::B::C).

Accordingly previously pending independent claims 1, 6, 9, 13, 19, and 20 have been amended to incorporate the limitation that the parsing is done in accordance with format specified by the parsing module, *of which there can be any number of formats.*

Applicants' amended claims require that the parsing is done in accordance with format specified by the parsing module which allows for any format to be parsed. Such an arrangement is not described or even remotely suggested by the Gershman reference. This is necessarily true as the ParseMeetingText procedure in Gershman only specifies one particular format that is able to be parsed and, similarly, does not possess the functionality to address multiple record formats. At most, the teachings of the Gershman reference can only be extended to a method of parsing a record according to a pre-defined record format. Such a method has nothing to do with processing data records having multiple formats, in which each format to be parsed has a plug-in module associated with it.

All of the pending claims now either include language explaining that the parsing is done in accordance with format specified by the parsing module, of which there can be any number of formats, or depend from claims that include such language. Therefore, Applicants submit that

In re Appln. of PANKOVCIN
Application No. 09/739,715
Reply to Office action of December 10, 2004

the rejections in the Office action have been rendered moot. As this technique for processing

data records having multiple formats, in which each format to be parsed has a plug-in module

associated with it, is not discussed in, nor suggested by, the cited art, Applicants further submit

that all of the pending claims are now allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is considered in good and

proper form for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to

issue. If, in the opinion of the examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution

of the subject application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott H. Schulhof, Reg. No. 53,568
One of the Attorneys for Applicants
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: March 10, 2005